

Core Team/Stakeholders Committee Meeting

State Resource Strategy Meeting

October 29, 2009

Fernan Ranger Station, Idaho Panhandle National Forests

Coeur d'Alene, Idaho

Core Team/Stakeholders Committee Members attending in Coeur d'Alene

- Dave Stephenson, Idaho Department of Lands
- Ara Andrea, Idaho State Technical Committee (NRCS)
- Ed Warner, Idaho Department of Lands – Forest Legacy Program
- Bob Helmer, Idaho Department of Lands – Endowment Lands
- Frank Gariglio, USDA – Natural Resource Conservation Service
- Craig Glazier, Forest Service – Region 1
- Cyndi Lane, Forest Service: Clearwater, Nez Perce/ Payette National Forests
- Mike Bowman, Idaho Community Forestry Advisory Council
- Serena Carlson, Intermountain Forest Association
- Chris Schnepf, University of Idaho Extension
- G. Kirk David, Idaho Forest Stewardship Advisory Committee
- David Gabrielsen, Forest Capital Partners
- Kurt Mettler, Coeur d'Alene Tribe

Core Team/ Stakeholders Committee Members attending remotely:

- Sharon LaBrecque, Forest Service: Sawtooth National Forest
- Greg Servheen, Idaho Dept of Fish and Wildlife
- Bob Unnasch, The Nature Conservancy
- Mike DeArmond – US Bureau of Land Management

Core Team/ Stakeholders Committee Members Unable to Attend:

- Steve Kimball, USDA Forest Service

Committee Staff Attendees:

- Meghan Lonneker – Idaho Department of Lands; GIS Analyst
- Andrew Mock – Idaho Department of Lands; GIS Analyst
- Ed DeYoung- Idaho Department of Lands; GIS Analyst

- Craig Foss, Idaho Department of Lands
- Jill Cobb, USDA Forest Service-IPNF and IDL, Note Taker

Meeting begin about 9:00 am

The meeting began with introductions. Dave explained that Steve Kimball will be taking the lead on the strategy development, but was unable to attend today's meeting due to illness.

Review of SAFR: Dave Stephenson

David reviewed the background and purpose of the State Assessment of Forest Needs and reviewed the changes in the maps made as a result of the last Stakeholder meeting. The attendees felt Draft 3 looked fine, and recommended adoption.

State Resource Strategy Discussion

Dave explained the purpose of the strategy development, and that these are intended to be long-term, include the big picture and prove comprehensive in nature. The group should be looking out five years or more for the strategies. Keep in mind the various stakeholders and how we can integrate across boundaries. The strategies should have realistic timelines and be dynamic enough so that actions can be revised as we progress over time.

Dave noted that we were in "uncharted" territory with the strategy document. He shared that several folks were attending a national meeting on state assessments and strategies next month and hope to learn more on national guidance and how other states are addressing their strategies.

Dave suggested a process that Steve had developed for how to proceed. These steps are:

1. Look at issue separately and develop the strategy to address the issue.
2. Decide how the state should be divided into meaningful areas for the strategy. Perhaps basin level, management units? What makes sense?
3. Strategy Matrix: Look at programs, potential stakeholders, means of measuring success and more. He suggested following a process outlined in [guidance from the Northeast Area Association of State Forester \(web-link\)](#).

Several reminders were presented to the group.

- Strategies should be thought of broadly
- Think outside of your box...be creative.

- Consider entire landscape spectrum...land uses and ownerships
- Strategies can already actions already occurring
- Consider what pieces are missing to fill in the “puzzle” to leverage resources for projects
- Who are the potential partners?
- Strategies are to function as guidelines...they are not prescriptive.
- Strategies should lead to project activities that are SMART: specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and have a timeline.

There was discussion on how detailed the strategies should be and what ownerships they should include. Dave clarified that the plan the strategy will serve as a guide and is not intended to be too specific or prescriptive. Strategies should be keyed on the highest risk areas and then we will develop goals and ultimately strategies to address the risks.

The group was reminded that at some point in the process, it would be good to include local specialists to help develop strategy. From the FS perspective on the Boise/Payette and Sawtooth, they would like to be fully coordinated so that the Strategy and Forests efforts fully support one another. Core team members should help with outreach to include key landowners and groups. The group realizes that the large landowners (FS) can have large effects. We can include the FS collaborative processes underway already as a part of the strategy.

The group’s focus is state and private lands, but the feds have considerably more resources. We’ll work to identify where strategies align with federal strategies/efforts.

As for process for this meeting, it was decided that for each issue, we would list generic strategies and then focus on the priority areas. Dave suggested that as a team, we should pick out five or six areas across the state and focus on those highest priority areas. The group agreed to begin with the high priority area of northern Idaho located just north of I-90. We called the area “North of I-90”. We begin with a review of the threats.

1st Issue/Threat: Forest Health: Mountain pine beetle, white pine blister rust and root disease. The rate of spread is projected to five years out.

2nd Issue/Threat: Wildfire. This threat is especially important to the communities west of Lake Pend Oreille. The threat is second in ranking to forest health. This issue is a potential threat to communities.

3rd Issue/Threat: Loss to Development. This is especially important in both Kootenai county and in the areas surrounding Sandpoint.

Next the group moved onto reviewing benefits.

1st Issue/Benefit: Air: Problem areas around Pend Oreille, Silver valley Rathdrum Prairie

2nd Issue/Benefit: Wildlife: High in the Selkirk and Scotchman Peak, (consider land bridges).

3rd Issue/Benefit: Water Quality and Quantity. Sixty-five percent of the area identified as “North of I-90” has this issue identified as high or moderate prioritization/benefits. The impervious areas are focused around Bonners Ferry, Sandpoint and Rathdrum Prairie.

The Core Team then began developing a list of long term goals, strategies and existing tools for each issue in the area identified as “North of I-90” (see table in separate document).

Next Meeting dates were set for December 17th and January 28th. Each meeting will begin at 9:00 am.

Notes Recorded by Jill Cobb and edited by Dave Stephenson and Steve Kimball.